REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments, and reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 and § 1.112, and in light of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Amendments

The title has been amended to be consistent with the claims in reciting a magnetic shielding layer.

The claims have been amended to cancel various dependent claims and insert the recitations of those claims regarding the particular composition into the independent claims. No new matter is presented.

Rejection undere 35 U.S.C. § 112[2]

The rejection hereunder regarding the use of "sheet-like" is respectfully traversed because there is no reasoning why the term is indefinite or would not be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. Because the claims recite a layer formed on a surface, the recitation of the geometry as being "sheet-like" is believed redundant and so has been cancelled. Hence, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Prior Art Rejections

Prior to addressing the substance of the rejections based on prior art, each of amended claims now recites a magnetic loss layer as a magnetic thin layer with a magnetic composition comprising M, X and Y, where M is a metallic magnetic material selected from the group consisting of at least one of Fe, Co, and Ni, X being an element or elements other than M and Y, and Y is at least one of F, N, and O. The magnetic thin layer with the M-X-Y magnetic composition has a structure where particles of the metallic magnetic material M are distributed throughout an X-Y matrix, as shown graphically in Fig. 1. In other words, the particles of M are uniformly or evenly distributed in the matrix as described at least at page 10, lines 9-11 of the present specification.

The magnetic loss layer has a high magnetic loss μ" at a high frequency region, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4. In addition, the magnetic loss layer has a relatively high electric resistance, as exemplified on page 11, line 7 (ignoring the table), of the specification.

In connection with the cited references, it is important keep in mind that particles of M are distributed throughout an X-Y matrix.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and (e)

The rejections hereunder alleging various claims are anticipated by Kobayashi (*et al.*), Ueoka (*et al.*), or Yoshikawa (*et al.*) are respectfully traversed.

Kobayashi ('801) discloses a display device having a front glass substrate with an anti-reflection member (provided with an antistatic function and an electromagnetic radiation shielding function). The portion of Kobayashi cited in the rejection relates to an optically transparent layer where, to improve its adhesion to a hard coat layer, includes an "element B," possibly Fe, "having the same or higher affinity for oxygen as an element [A] which constitutes the transparent conductive oxide." (Col. 4, ln. 28-34.) There is absolutely no disclosure of shielding or magnetic loss properties after the summary of the invention, no disclosure of saturation magnetization, and no disclosure of the claimed structure of M dispersed in an X-Y matrix. Comparing the examples in this application with those given in column seven of Kobayashi makes clear that the compositions are very different. This reference does not anticipate any of the present claims.

Ueoka ('474) discloses a plasma display panel having a front glass substrate with an electromagnetic field shielding layer (made of an electro-conductive material). The portion cited in the rejection relates to a structure of separate compositions, not the claimed X-Y matrix with M dispersed therein. The cited portion (col. 6, ln. 40-60) describes a photosensitive resin applied to the display side, exposed to produce a grid, and the grid is then filled with a black pigment paste then a silver pigment paste (ln. 45-48) wherein the black pigment in the paste is a mixture of iron, cobalt, and chromium oxides

(ln. 49-50; see also col. 7, ln. 52-64). This reference does not anticipate any of the present claims.

As Yoshikawa was not cited against any of the composition claims now incorporated into the independent claims, this rejection is moot.

Accordingly, all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should now be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The rejection of claims 18-19 as obvious over the combination of Kobayashi and Ballato (*et al.*), and claims 22 and 34 as obvious over the combination of Lee and Kobayashi, are respectfully traversed. These rejections rely on the statements made in the rejections for anticipation with regard to the composition disclosed by Kobayashi. Because it has been shown above that Kobayashi does not disclose the claimed structure of M in an X-Y matrix, Lee discloses only an Fe–Ni alloy, and Ballato appears to disclose no particular shielding composition, these rejections should now be withdrawn.

The rejectin of claims 40 and 41 as obvious over the combination of Ueoka, Lee, and Kobayashi is respectfully traversed. As shown above, Ueoka does not disclose the claimed composition, and as that reference is the only one relied upon in this rejection to show the claimed M-X-Y composition, this rejection should now be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 23 and 35 as obvious over the combination of Lee, Kobayashi, and Yasuhiro (JP 09-188545) is respectfully traversed. As shown above, neither Lee nor Kobayashi disclose the claimed M-X-Y composition. Yasuhiro describes a paint having coprecipitated particles of different metals that are dispersed in a vehicle and applied by spin-coating. Example 1 coprecipitates ruthenium chloride and cobalt chloride, then dries, calcines in air (to oxidize), grinds, disperses ground particles in paint medium, and spin-coats. There is no disclosure of an X-Y matrix in which particles of M are dispersed. Rather, the examples in Yasuhiro clearly suggest that there will be oxides of any metal present because of the calcining step, and accordingly not the claimed X-Y matrix with M dispersed therein. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn.